

REMARKS

Applicants' Response to the Examiner's Rejection of the Title as Non-Descriptive.

The Examiner requires a new title of the invention which is more descriptive. Applicants have amended the title.

Applicants' Response to the Examiner's Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as Anticipated by *Shiraishi '062*.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Shiraishi '062*. In view of this rejection, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 to clarify that the height of the integrated circuit chip, including the layer, from the mounting surface is lower than the height of the head slider from the mounting surface. The limitations of claim 7 are added to claims 1 and 8 and claim 7 has been canceled. As such, the rejection is moot.

Applicants' Response to the Examiner's Rejection of Claim 3, 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being Unpatentable over *Shiraishi '062*.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shiraishi '062*. Claims 3, 6 and 9 are dependent upon the base claims 1 and 8. As such, this rejection has been rendered moot by the present amendment.

Applicants' Response to the Examiner's Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being Unpatentable over Shiraishi '062 in view of JP57-057556.

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shiraishi '062* in view of JP57-057556. This rejection has been rendered moot by the present amendment.

Applicants' Response to the Examiner's Rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being Unpatentable over Shiraishi '062 in view of Shiraishi '746.

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shiraishi '062* in view of *Shiraishi '746*. Applicants have canceled claim 7. In addition, the limitations of claim 7, now incorporated into claims 1 and 8, are not obvious from *Shiraishi '062* and *Shiraishi et al. '746*.

Shiraishi '062 fails to teach or suggest covering the integrated circuit chip by a layer to prevent generation of foreign particles, in order to solve the problems of the prior art described on page 2, line 11 to page 3, line 9 of the specification. Hence, *Shiraishi '062* does not anticipate nor suggest the intended purpose of the Applicants' invention. Namely, the present invention is for the protection of the I.C. chip from foreign particles which cause a head crash.

Further, as noted by the Examiner, in paragraph 12 on page 7 of the Office Action, *Shiraishi '062* is silent as to the integrated circuit chip height being "lower than a height of the head slider from the mounting surface." Applicants have included this distinction into independent claims 1 and 8 in the above amendments.

The Examiner also asserts that *Shiraishi et al. '746* teaches the features taught in

Shiraishi '062, and that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of *Shiraishi '062* and *Shiraishi et al. '746*.

Applicants respectfully traverse. The object of *Shiraishi '062* is to improve the mechanical impact resistance of the head IC chip. In order to achieve this object, it is essential in *Shiraishi '062* to provide a relatively thick shock absorption layer 25. Otherwise, the mechanical impact resistance of the head IC chip 13 cannot be expected. In addition, it would seem essential in *Shiraishi '062* to provide a projecting layer portion of the shock absorption layer 25 at the top peripheral edges of the head IC chip 13 in order to improve the mechanical impact resistance of the head IC chip 13, as may be seen from Fig. 3.

On the other hand, the object of *Shiraishi et al. '746* is to suppress the temperature increase in the head IC chip. This object is completely unrelated to that of *Shiraishi '062*. *Shiraishi et al. '746* does not teach or suggest improving the mechanical impact resistance of the head IC chip, and does not teach or suggest providing a shock absorption layer on the head IC chip.

Therefore, it would not seem obvious to make the shock absorption layer 25 of *Shiraishi '062* thin in order to satisfy the height relationship shown in Fig. 4 of *Shiraishi et al. '746*, since it would not be able to achieve the original object of *Shiraishi '062* if the shock absorption layer 25 were thin. But if the shock absorption layer 25 of *Shiraishi '062* were thick as originally intended, this would not satisfy the height relationship shown in Fig. 4 of *Shiraishi et al. '746*. In other words, one skilled in the art would not combine the teachings of *Shiraishi '062* and *Shiraishi et al. '746* because their objects are completely different and the requirements of both

cannot be satisfied simultaneously.

New Claims.

Applicants have added new claims 30, 31, 32 and 33 for consideration. The new claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, and include no new matter. Applicants believe that the new claims are allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion.

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended in order to more particularly point out, and distinctly claim the subject matter to which the Applicants regard as their invention. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated **March 28, 2002**.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1 and 8, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "**Version with markings to show changes made.**"

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully Submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP


Scott M. Daniels Reg. No. 32,878

Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 32,562

SMD/rer

Atty. Docket No. **000452**
Suite 1000, 1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Version with markings to show changes made

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/548,313

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend claims 1 and 8 as follows:

1. (Amended) A head assembly comprising:

a mounting surface; [and]

an integrated circuit chip which is mounted on the mounting surface and processes signals[,]; and

a head slider provided with a head,

 said integrated circuit chip being covered by a layer,

a height of the integrated circuit chip, including the layer, being lower than a
height of the head slider from the mounting surface.

8. (Amended) A disk unit for reading information from and writing information to a disk, comprising:

 a head assembly having a mounting surface, a head [mounted on the mounting surface] slider provided with a head, and an integrated circuit chip which is mounted on the mounting surface and processes information read from and/or written to the disk via the head,

 said integrated circuit chip being covered by a layer,

a height of the integrated circuit chip, including the layer, being lower than a
height of the head slider from the mounting surface.